

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheet replaces the originally filed drawing sheet containing Fig. 4. This replacement sheet includes two changes in Fig. 4, consisting of the following:

- (1) addition of a previously omitted arrow for leading numeral "10" to the rod clamping device illustrated in this Figure, and
- (2) addition of a previously omitted line showing the numeral "74" as designating the inner surface of cap section 24 as first described in lines 3 – 7 at the top of page 9 of the specification.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet Fig. 4

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. In view of the Examiner's continuing and final adherence to the earlier restriction requirement as to Species B, C and E, Applicant specifically retains the right to present in divisional applications claims 16, 19, 20, 21 and 22 as now withdrawn in the present application. Applicant is still uncertain, however, as to the basis for the restriction requirement, particularly as to Specie B, wherein the same exact machine and mode of operation are involved irrespective of the manner in which the machine may be mounted – whether by the device or the rod. Allowed claim 1, for example, is directed to a mechanism which controls movement between the device and the rod, and in no way requires or specifies that only the device is fixed and only the rod is movable.
2. By the present amendment, the informalities noted in this objection have been corrected.
3. In response to the reminder in this section of the Office Action, Applicant has amended the Abstract to reduce its text to 150 words.
4. As of the date of this Amendment, Applicant is not aware of any uncorrected errors in the specification. By this Amendment, Applicant has corrected one minor error found by the Examiner in figure 4 of the drawings as well as a second error found by Applicant in the same figure (lead line for element "74").
5. The several informalities specified by the Examiner in claims 8, 15 and 18 have been corrected.
6. In reference to the objection noted by the Examiner in connection with claim 14, Applicant would like to call attention to the following representative sample of several

very similar definitions present in various dictionaries for the words "rectangle" and "rectangular".

In Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, Second College Edition, as published by Simon & Schuster, Inc. and last copyrighted in 1984, the word "rectangle" is defined as "any four sided plain figure with four right angles" The word "rectangular" is defined as "1. shaped like a rectangle; having four sides and four right angles 2. having right angled corners or a base in the form of a rectangle, as a building 3. right-angled."

Based on these and other similar definitions, as well as common usage and understanding of the terms in the mechanical arts, Applicant submits that the word "rectangular" in claim 14 clearly and correctly defines the four sided figure with four right angles illustrated in figure 8. In an effort to avoid further discussion concerning this point, however, Applicant has amended claim 14 to specify the cross section as being defined by "four generally straight sides connected by four right angles" This clearly is an apt description of the central bore of the bushing. That the four sides are illustrated as being substantially equal in length should not render the figure as anything other than "rectangular"

To remove the objection noted by the Examiner with respect to claim 15 and figure 7, Applicant has amended the claim and the specification to remove and replace the incorrect term "octagonal with the correct term "hexagonal" as clearly illustrated in figure 7 as originally filed in this application.

7. In the corrected figure 4 drawing filed with this Amendment, the missing arrow has been added. Also, in the same figure, applicant has added a missing lead line to the numeral "74".

8 & 9. With respect to Claim 5, applicant has amended line 5 to specify "an annular space". It is believed that this amendment will overcome the rejection noted by the Examiner.

As to the rejection of claim 7, applicant would like to call attention to lines 11 and 12 of claim 4 wherein the description "said actuating piston being – generally ring shaped," appears. This language is believed to be an adequate antecedent basis for the claim limitation pointed out by the Examiner.

10. For the reasons pointed out in the immediately preceding section, applicant believes that claims 5 and 7 should now be allowable.

11. As claims 15 and 18 have been amended to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in paragraph 5 of the Office Action, it is believed that these claims should also be allowable.

12. It is noted that the Examiner has stated that claims 1-4, 12-14 and 17 are allowed.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully Submitted

Jerry E. Heinzeroth

By



Thomas E. Frantz, Registration No. 24,814

Tel.: (319) 372-1890

Date: January 30, 2006